

Message

From: Desroches, Neil (NWD) [/O=COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS/OU=MASSMAIL-01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=NEIL.DESROCHES]
Sent: 9/29/2010 7:51:22 PM
To: Farak, Sonja (DPH) [/O=COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS/OU=MassMail-01/cn=Recipients/cn=Sonja.Farak]
Subject: RE: v. [REDACTED] JT on 9/30/10

Sonja,

The [REDACTED] saga is over, so we will not need you. She pled out moments ago and currently has no open cases involving drug certs. Thank you very much for being on top of this!

From: Farak, Sonja (DPH)
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2010 2:35 PM
To: Desroches, Neil (NWD)
Subject: RE: v. [REDACTED] JT on 9/30/10
Hi Neil-

Thanks for the clarification with the numbers (my guess is that [REDACTED] was a prior arrest???). As for my case in Pittsfield, the ADA wrote me: "Based on what I can gather about the case for tomorrow, there is a chance it could be resolved without a trial. Would it be alright to have you on-call?" So I'll be on call tomorrow for Pittsfield (and probably not need to go), so should anything change with your case and you need me in Orange, there is a decent chance that I will be available, though I am not sure what Rebecca's schedule is. Please just keep me informed what is going on --- Thanks.

-Sonja

Sonja Farak
Drug Analysis Lab

From: Desroches, Neil (NWD)
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 9:55 PM
To: Farak, Sonja (DPH)
Subject: RE: v. [REDACTED] JT on 9/30/10

Sonja, I cannot figure out where the [REDACTED] trial. She has an separate open case involving possession of Class B (Oxycontin), and we do not have the certs in that matter, so I cannot be certain it is not connected to that matter. Long story short, [REDACTED] is not related to the matter shceduled for trial.

The defense attorney brought the cases forward to tomorrow to tender a plea (which is largely agreed), so I will let you know as soon as I hear the result.

From: Farak, Sonja (DPH)
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 1:20 PM
To: Desroches, Neil (NWD)
Subject: RE: v. [REDACTED] T on 9/30/10
Neil-

So I think I've got this right --- the drug lab numbers needed for trial are:

[REDACTED] (def. listed as [REDACTED], chemist = Rebecca)

[REDACTED] (def. listed [REDACTED] chemist = Sonja)

[REDACTED] (def. listed as [REDACTED] chemist = Sonja)? Is this submission part of the case? Thanks for your help.

-Sonja

From: Desroches, Neil (NWD)

Sent: Monday, September 27, 2010 5:48 PM

To: Farak, Sonja (DPH)

Subject: RE: v. [REDACTED] JT on 9/30/10

Hi Sonja, first, I apologize on Dave's behalf for his lack of responsiveness, I really appreciate you're being on top of this issue and making us aware.

I believe most of the confusion comes from the fact that the drugs submitted under [REDACTED] are, were seized as part of the same execution of a search warrant. Technically, we would probably need both you and Rebecca to testify, but, I understand how impractical that is and I'm sure I can work something out. This may all be a moot point, though, because the defense attorney contacted me today and I believe a resolution short of trial is likely. I will keep you posted.

Thank you!!!

From: Farak, Sonja (DPH)

Sent: Monday, September 27, 2010 11:13 AM

To: Desroches, Neil (NWD)

Subject: FW: v. [REDACTED] JT on 9/30/10

Neil-

I just found out that you will be the ADA in Orange this Thursday (Sept. 30, 2010) taking over for David Lemasa on the [REDACTED] case. I've been trying to get in touch with Dave for about a month and a half regarding this case, and am hopeful that I will be able to get my questions answered from you. Please see the forwarded message that I sent him on August 5th. If you need to contact me, you can always email me or give me a call at the lab (413-545-2607). Thanks.

-Sonja

Sonja Farak

Drug Analysis Lab

From: Farak, Sonja (DPH)

Sent: Thursday, August 05, 2010 11:08 AM

To: Lemasa, David (NWD)

Subject: v. [REDACTED]

Hi Dave-

I received your summons for the [REDACTED] trial scheduled for September 30, 2010 and I have a few questions/comments. First, the Drug Certificate numbers listed on the summons are [REDACTED]. The defendant listed on the first number [REDACTED] is listed as [REDACTED] but I was not the chemist that preformed the analysis on this sample (Rebecca Pontes is). Also submitted the same day by the Athol police were [REDACTED] chemist = Rebecca). As for the second number [REDACTED], the lab does not have a submission for that number (or any number above 0600 for that matter). I looked up submission [REDACTED] thinking that it might be a typo, and, although I am the chemist for that number, the defendant was listed as [REDACTED]. Finally I looked up the defendants name [REDACTED] and found one other submission that had that name on it which I had analyzed [REDACTED]. With all this stated, would you mind clearing up for me which drug lab certificate numbers are actually involved with this case?

Second, I may have a conflict on September 30 as I am suppose to be in Pittsfield District Court that day, though it is early and things may change (note as of Sept. 27th = the Pittsfield case is still on).

Thanks.

-Sonja

Sonja Farak
Drug Analysis Lab